

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed July 28, 2006 considered claims 1-28 and 42-59. Claims 1-4, 8-13, 16, 17, 19-24, 26, 27, 42-44, 48, 49, 56, 57 and 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Freund et al.* (US 2003/0167405) hereinafter *Freund* and further in view of *Korpi et al.* (US 6,198,696) hereinafter *Korpi*. Claims 5-7, 114, 15, 18, 25, 28, 54 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Freund* in view of *Korpi* and further in view of *Lipe et al.* (US 5,748,980) hereinafter *Lipe*. Claims 45, 52 and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Freund* in view of *Korpi* and further in view of *Phillips* (US 6,748,195) hereinafter *Phillips*. Claims 46, 50 and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Freund* in view of *Korpi* and further in view of *Akiyama et al.* (US 6,757,821) hereinafter *Akiyama*. Claim 47 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Freund* in view of *Korpi* and further in view of *McKeeth* (US 6,260,140) hereinafter *McKeeth*. Claim 58 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Freund* in view of *Korpi* and further in view of *I'Anson et al.* (US 6,760,046) hereinafter *I'Anson*.¹

By this paper, claims 1 and 42 have been amended² claim 60 has been added and claims 47, 57, and 58 have been cancelled, such that claims 1-28 and 42-46, 48-56, 59 and 60 remain pending, of which claims 1 and 42 are the only independent claims at issue.

The application is generally directed to embodiments for selecting characteristics associated with a network environment a computer system is being newly connected to, so as to reduce the configuration information that needs to be manually entered by a user. The recited embodiments include connecting a computer system, which is configured with a first configuration, to a network environment from among the number of network environments. Then, parameters are received from the new network environment, which are combined to generate an identifier. The identifier is then used to select characteristics specific to the network environment that the computer system is being connected to. Using these selected characteristics, which correspond specifically to the network environment that the computer system is being connected to, the configuration of the computer system is modified from the first configuration to a new configuration.

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

² Support for the amendments to claim 1 can be found at paragraphs [0066-0068] and support for the amendment to claim 58 can be found at paragraph [0065].

There are a number of rejections that are presently traversed, and have been previously traversed and which the Examiner has not addressed the previous traversal. To highlight at least two of these issues, applicants have amended to independent claims of the application to incorporate elements into the independent claims.

For example, claim 1 now recites "wherein modifying the configuration of the computer system includes changing one or more country dependent software settings including one or more of a default language setting and a currency symbol setting" which was previously the subject matter of now cancelled claims 57 and 58. To show this limitation, the Examiner cites to *I'Anson* at col. 9, lines 28-38, which is reproduced in context below:

In accordance with an embodiment of the present invention, the scripts 82 enable the user to store two versions of their private home page, namely a "home" private home page 83 intended for use when the user is in a home area, and an "away" private home page 84 intended for use when the user is away from their home area. The "home" version 83 may, for example, include links to store websites and event websites for stores and events local to the user's home area; the "away" version 84 may, for example, includes links to map websites, travel websites, currency exchange websites etc.

Careful examination of this citation reveals, that *I'Anson* does not teach what is recited by the claims of the present application, but rather only teaches a home page where the away home page includes links to map websites, travel websites, currency exchange websites etc. This is not default language settings and currency symbol settings in software being changed. While the links may indeed link to websites that are in different languages and that include a number of different currency symbols, the default settings of any software have not been changed in the teachings of *I'Anson*. Thus, claim 1 is patentably distinct from the references cited by the Examiner.

With regard to claim 42, claim 42 now includes subject matter previously recited in claim 47. In particular, claim 47 now recites: "wherein modifying the configuration of the computer system includes changing a favorites list from one appropriate for a first network environment to one appropriate for a different second network environment." The Examiner's attention is directed to the current specification at paragraph [0065], where a specific example of this functionality is illustrated. In particular, specification points out that a user's favorites list is changed when a computer system is moved between a corporate internet and a home office network. To show this functionality, the Examiner cites to *McKeeth* at col. 5, lines 38-54 which are reproduced in context below:

At step 214 it is determined if any "data" file changes made for OS #2 need to be integrated for OS #1. Data files can be application program files such as bookmarks for an INTERNET browser. If no data file changes need to be integrated, or if the user has decided not to integrate data file changes, the processing continues at step 220 to determine if any OS settings file changes need to be integrated. If there were data file changes, the processing determines and modifies any OS specific references so that they reference the current OS (216). That is, any data file change pointing to OS #2 or otherwise setup for OS #2 would have to be verified that they

could be suitable for use with OS #1 and then modified to reference OS #1. Once the data file changes are modified for OS #1, they are copied into the appropriate OS #1 data file (step 218). In addition, where possible, the data file itself will be copied into the appropriate directory for OS #1. Once the data file changes have been integrated, the processing continues at step 220 to determine if any OS settings file changes need to be integrated. It must be noted, that although not shown in FIG. 3, the processing 200 would check the record change file for additional data file changes and loop through steps 214 to 218 to integrate them.

Notably, *McKeeth* is directed to integrating setting changes in a first operating system into a second operating system when a dual operating system is used. Abstract. In other words, the system settings are synchronized between the operating systems. Read in this context, it is clear that the portion of *McKeeth* cited to show changing favorites list actually shows synchronizing the favorites list for both operating system environments by integrating changed files which may include bookmarks. This is exactly the opposite of what is recited by the claims of the present application. In particular, the claims of the present application recite "changing a favorites list from one appropriate for a first network environment to one appropriate for a different second network environment..." Additionally, it should be noted that the changes illustrated in *McKeeth* result from changing operating systems and not from connecting to a particular network environment as is recited by claim 42.

As a further matter, claim 16 recites: "an act of receiving one or more parameters associated with the computer system that were provided by a first network environment and will be used to select characteristics associated with a second network environment." To show this element, the Examiner cites to *Freund* page 7, paragraph [0095], which is reproduced below:

FIG. 4 is a flow chart illustrating detailed method steps of the operations of the network detection and firewall reconfiguration system of the present invention. Initially, the system starts with no knowledge of any connected networks or adapters. At step 401, the engine constructs an initial list of adapters and networks to which these adapters are connected by obtaining information through the OS network information API. When a mobile computer or device (on which the system is installed) is connected to a different network, the engine, at step 402, uses the OS network information API and the associated operating system kernel facility to discover that an adapter has been added or removed or an adapter's network configuration has changed.

Notably, this paragraph does not teach what is recited by claim 16. Rather, this paragraph teaches "constructing an initial list of adapters and networks to which these adapters are connected..." and "discover[ing] that an adapter has been added or removed or an adapter's network configuration has changed." Thus, in contrast to what is recited by claim 16, *Freund* teaches configuring for known adapters and connected networks. Nowhere does this reference show receiving parameters from one network environment used for a second network environment, as is recited by claim 16.

Additionally, applicants further point that new claim 60 adds the further limitation to claim 1 of "wherein modifying the configuration of the computer system further includes changing a favorites list

from one appropriate for a first network environment to one appropriate for a different second network environment."

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicants acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicants reserve the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicants specifically request that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 28th day of September, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
J. LAVAR OLDHAM
Registration No. 53,409
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 047973

JLO:crb:ahy
AHY0000001606V001